



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,213	03/24/2006	Paul Haslauer	U 015914-2	4499
140 LADAS & PARRY 26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023	7590 04/04/2007		EXAMINER PAPAPIETRO, JACQUELINE M	
			ART UNIT 3739	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/551,213	HASLAUER, PAUL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jacqueline Papapietro	3739	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2006 and 28 September 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2005 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/06.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 9 and 10 are references in line 2 of page 4. There are no claims 9 or 10. The specification should not include references to the claims or claim numbers.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The invention is not positively stated in the claims, but rather it is only implied.

Regarding claim 4, the phrase "or the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams-Ray et al (US 3051180).

Adams-Ray discloses a method for operating a warm or hot air booth (11, Fig 1) by using a cold medium for generating stimuli in the human body (column 2 lines 25-30), characterized in that the warm air is circulated in a booth (through vents 20) on the ceiling side thereof (12) and calmed at time intervals (column 3 lines 10-14) and the cold medium is introduced into the flowing warm air at the ceiling side (12, through

vents 20); wherein the calming of the air is achieved by periodically interrupting the hot air circulation by switching off a fan (22).

Adams-Ray also discloses a warm air booth comprising a heating means (25, Fig 1) and an air circulating means (22), and a device for supplying cold media (21 and 22) arranged on the ceiling side in the region of the air circulating means (see Fig 1); wherein the air circulating means comprises a rotor (22) which is covered by an ejector disk (blades of the fan 22) for introducing the cold medium with outwardly directed extending ejecting fingers (fan blades 22).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams-Ray in view of Kamada et al (Us 6503060 B1).

Adams-Ray discloses the warm air booth according to claim 4, as described above, but does not disclose a segment ring. Kamada teaches a segment ring (4, Fig 18) in order to shield the components of a fan (50) from a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the segment ring as taught by Kamada in the warm air booth of Adams-Ray in order to increase the safety of the user.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams-Ray.

Adams-Ray discloses the warm air booth, as applied to claim 3, above, with a heating device formed as an electric furnace (37, Fig 3, column 3 lines 22-23) which has a fresh air inlet (column 2 lines 20-21) and a channel duct (20, Fig 1) which ends in the booth space at a closing wall of the furnace (see Fig 1) and inherently forms a safety means against unauthorized manipulations in the furnace; and wherein the fresh air is guided through at least one second duct (another vent 20, Fig 1) which ends in the warm air booth through an opening. Adams-Ray does not disclose a fireclay lining. Fireclay, by definition, is used to make firebrick, which is especially used for lining furnaces or fireplaces (Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have lined the pipe of Adams-Ray in fireclay in order that the invention can withstand the high temperatures produced by the furnace.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline Papapietro whose telephone number is (571) 272-1546. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMP  
Jacqueline Papapietro  
Art Unit 3739



LINDA C. M. DVORAK  
CROSS-EXAMINER  
GROUP 370